DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 424 EA 011 856

AUTHOR Gregory, Sundra
TITLE SPECS Field Test Sites: The Perceptions of Teachers and Administrators.
INSTITUTION Oregon Univ., Eugene. Center for Educational Policy and Management.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 76
NOTE 80p.; For related documents, see ED 087 442, ED 111 073, ED 168 110-117, EA 011 854-855, and EA 011 877

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

In 1976 a survey was done to ascertain teacher and administrator responses to the School Planning, Evaluation, and Communication System in six districts in which it was implemented. Research was conducted through written questionnaires. Three districts provided enough data for detailed analysis, and two provided enough data for brief discussion. Data collected for each district focused on such issues as introduction, use, actual consequences, and evaluations of SPECS. A general overview of data revealed that at least 75 percent of responding teachers felt that after SPECS, (1) their instruction was more individualized, (2) evaluation of students was improved, (3) goals and objectives were better coordinated with those of others, (4) course planning had improved, (5) progress reports to parents were facilitated, and (6) ability to choose course materials was improved. On the whole, the data suggest that most teachers in the sample had a favorable attitude toward SPECS although a sizeable minority were unenthusiastic. Among the fourteen administrators represented in this study, there was almost total unanimity in endorsing SPECS. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED172424

SPECS FIELD TEST SITES:

The Perceptions of Teachers and Administrators

Sundra Gregory

SPECS
Center for Educational Policy and Management
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97401

November 1976

EA 011 856

This report was developed by the staff of the SPECS Program within CASEA, the research and development unit of the Center for Educational Policy and Management (CEPM) at the University of Oregon. CEPM is supported in part by funds from the National Institute of Education (NIE). Opinions expressed in the report do not necessarily reflect policies or positions of either CEPM or NIE, and no official endorsement by either organization should be inferred.

The University of Oregon is a member of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. It is the policy of the University of Oregon that discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national orgin shall not exist in the University. This policy is intended to implement the requirements of EO 11246, EO 11375, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Section 503 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973. This policy applies to all aspects of employment, admission, education and facilities. Information concerning these policies and their implementation may be obtained from Myra T. Willard, Director, Office of Affirmative Action, Room 465, Oregon Hall, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403. Telephone 503: 686-3123.

INTRODUCTION

SPECS (School Planning, Evaluation and Communication System) is a program planning and budgeting system which was developed at the Center for Educational Policy and Management at the University of Oregon.[1] In the spring of 1976, a research study was planned and carried out in an attempt to ascertain the responses to SPECS of teachers and administrators in the SPECS field test sites located throughout the United States. The six districts discussed in this study are those where SPECS has been most completely implemented and which are currently most active in SPECS implementation.

The research was conducted by means of written questionnaires including one form for teachers (see appendix A) and another for administrators (see appendix B).

One person was selected from each site to be responsible for the distribution of questionnaires. In four districts, all questionnaires were routed through the SPECS coordinator. In another district, most of the questionnaires were distributed by the SPECS coordinator, although the two school principals received their questionnaires directly. In the sixth district, all questionnaires were sent to the principal of the one school where SPECS had been implemented.

All responses were anonymous and were compensated at the flat rate of $7.50. The cover letter stressed that the researchers were interested in the veridical perceptions of the respondents, but not in their individual identities.

---

[1] For an overview of SPECS, See SPECS: What It Is and What It Does, by John M. Nagle and Harold E. Walker, Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 1975

The response rates varied across the districts between 3% and 75%. Since the return rate of 3% represented only one teacher questionnaire, the district was dropped from the study, leaving five districts whose response rates varied between 43% and 75%.

Three districts provided sufficient data for a detailed discussion of issues pertaining to SPECS. These will be discussed in the first three sections.

In two districts, where only a few people had been involved with SPECS, only one teacher questionnaire was returned from each. These two districts will be discussed briefly in sections four and five.

It must be stressed that this paper is not intended to be an evaluation of SPECS in schools. In the first place, evaluation is beyond the scope of the design of this study; systematic appraisal of costs and benefits was not undertaken. Secondly, SPECS was implemented and used in different ways by each district. In some locations, only part of the system was implemented; in others, the SPECS program was supplemented by other materials and programs. Therefore, with this sample of districts, an evaluation of SPECS in and of itself would be virtually impossible.

Each of the first five sections of this paper will be devoted to one district, beginning with a description of the district and its SPECS activities. In the sixth section, general observations and comments will be made.

The names associated with all of the school districts discussed here are fictional. When district names are used, they may be assumed to refer only to the schools within those districts in which SPECS was implemented. In all of the districts referred to in this paper, only some of the schools and personnel within those schools participated; however, it is important to remember that only those individuals who were directly involved with SPECS are referred to in this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

I. MOTT SCHOOL DISTRICT....1

Teachers' Perceptions....2

- Introduction of SPECS....2
- Use of SPECS....5
- Actual Consequences of SPECS....8
- Possible Consequences of SPECS....12
- Interaction of Teachers and Administrators....13
- Evaluations of SPECS....17
- Advice to Other Teachers....20

Administrators' Perceptions....21

- Introduction of SPECS....21
- Use of Specs....23
- Benefits and Problems Resultant from SPECS....25
- Evaluations of SPECS....25

II. BETHUNE RIVER SCHOOL DISTRICT....27

Teachers' Perceptions....28

- Introduction of SPECS....28
- Use of SPECS....31
- Actual Consequences of SPECS....33
- Possible Consequences of SPECS....35
- Interaction of Teachers and Administrators....36
- Evaluations of SPECS....39
- Advice to Other Teachers....41

Administrators' Perceptions....42
- Introduction of SPECS....42
- Use of SPECS....44
- Benefits and Problems Resultant from SPECS....46
- Evaluations of SPECS....46

III. ANTHONY SCHOOL DISTRICT....49

Teachers' Perceptions....49
- Introduction of SPECS....49
- Use of SPECS....51
- Actual Consequences of SPECS....52
- Possible Consequences of SPECS....53
- Interaction of Teachers and Administrators....53
- Evaluations of SPECS....56
- Advice to Other Teachers....57

Administrators' Perceptions....58
- Introduction of SPECS....58
- Use of SPECS....59
- Benefits and Problems Resultant from SPECS....60
- Evaluations of SPECS....60

IV. GILMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT....62

V. BEECHER SCHOOL DISTRICT....67

VI. SUMMARY....70

APPENDIXES

I

MOTT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mott School District is located in a major mining area in a Western state. This K-12 district has eighteen elementary schools, two junior high schools, one high school and one vocational-technical institute. The total student enrollment in the district is approximately 9,000.

During the 1974-75 school year, SPECS activity in Mott was centered in two elementary schools which served as pilot schools for the district. In 1975-76, SPECS activities were expanded to include the introduction of Components One, Two, and Three into the two junior high schools and the high school, planning for a coordinated kindergarten program, and continued planning, albeit in a modified form, for district-wide involvement in Components Four and Five.

Written questionnaires were sent to the teachers who had implemented Component Three including seventeen teachers at the elementary schools and twenty teachers at the junior highs and high school. Questionnaires were also sent to four principals, the curriculum director, and superintendent who had been directly involved with SPECS.

Of the seventeen questionnaires sent to elementary teachers, seven [41%] were returned. Eleven [65%] of the questionnaires distributed to junior high and high school teachers were returned. Of the six administrator questionnaires, three [50%] were returned.

In the discussion of teacher perceptions which follows, the elementary teachers' responses will be reported separately from the responses of the junior and senior high school teachers. This is necessary because of these groups' very different experiences with SPECS. Most of the elementary teachers had worked with SPECS for two years and had used the Component Three instruc-

tional materials. The secondary teachers, however, had been involved with SPECS for only one year, had been primarily engaged in planning activities, and had not used Component Three in their classrooms.

A year before this study was begun, the elementary teachers who had used Component Three during the 1974-75 school year were interviewed in person, and the findings were reported in a paper by the author.[2] For comparison, some of the data from that study will be included below and will be labelled "elementary teachers 1975". The undated references to elementary and secondary teachers refer to the responses obtained in this study.

Teachers' Perceptions

In the following discussion, the number of teachers responding will be reported, followed by the percentage [in brackets] based on the number of teachers within the subgroup. As mentioned above, this data includes the responses of seven elementary teachers and eleven secondary teachers. The 1975 data includes the responses of sixteen elementary teachers.

Introduction of SPECS

The first item of the questionnaire asked the teacher to recall his/her initial reaction to SPECS. As shown in Table 1, neither group was strongly favorable in their initial reactions to SPECS, but at the same time, no teacher described him/herself as very unfavorable to SPECS.

---

[2]Sundra Gregory, "SPECS In Two Districts: The Perceptions of Teachers and Administrators," Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 1975.

Table 1
Mott Teachers' Initial Reactions to SPECS

	Very Favorable	Somewhat Favorable	Indifferent	Somewhat Unfavorable	Very Unfavorable
Elementary Teachers	2[29%]	1[14%]	2[29%]	2[29%]	0[0%]
Secondary Teachers	0[0%]	4[36%]	4[36%]	3[27%]	0[0%]
Total	2[11%]	5[28%]	6[33%]	5[28%]	0[0%]

The elementary teachers in Mott described the decision to implement SPECS in their schools as a cooperative decision shared by administrators and the teaching staff. Five respondents [71%] stated that school administrators and the teaching staff had jointly decided that their schools would pilot SPECS in the district, one respondent [14%] said that the teachers had made this decision, and one respondent [14%] reported that s/he was unsure how the decision had been made.

In contrast, eleven [100%] of the secondary teachers stated that the decision to begin work on Component Three in their schools had been made entirely by administrators. No teacher reported having had a role in the decision to introduce SPECS at the school level.

At the level of the individual classroom, six elementary teachers [86%] said that they had felt free to use Component Three or to decline to use Component Three in their own classrooms. The remaining teacher [14%] indicated that s/he had voted to implement SPECS at the school level and considered this decision to imply willingness to participate as an individual.

When the secondary teachers were asked whether they had had a role in the decision to implement Component Three in their own classrooms, seven teachers

[64%] answered NO and four teachers [36%] answered YES. However, it was unclear what was meant by a NO response since most of the secondary teachers had not yet begun to use Component Three in their classrooms. Therefore, a NO response to this question may have been the teacher's way of indicating that the decision had not yet been made. On the other hand, it could also have meant that the respondent assumed s/he would be using SPECS in the future and had not had a role in that decision. The position of the respondents who answered YES to this question was succinctly summarized by one teacher: "It was my decision to use or not to use anything I thought was of value."

When asked how they felt about the manner in which SPECS had been brought into their schools, six elementary teachers [86%] expressed accepting, positive attitudes. One elementary teacher [14%] reportedly found the manner of decision-making to have been acceptable, but felt confused by the rapid pace of events. In answer to the same question, three secondary teachers [27%] approved of the manner in which SPECS had been brought into their schools, five [45%] were indifferent or ambivalent, two [18%] were'disapproving', and one [9%] responded that SPECS had not been implemented. The concerns of some of the teachers may have been expressed by the individual who commented: "I feel a majority decision would have been better; however, someone must be the instigator."

When asked why SPECS had been adopted in their schools, all seven elementary teachers responded differently. These responses included (1) to improve teaching procedures, (2) to save teachers time in planning, (3) to improve the curriculum, (4) because the principal wanted SPECS, (5) because the staff wanted SPECS, (6) to serve as a pilot school for SPECS, and (7) don't know. It is interesting that among teachers who perceived that they shared in the decision to adopt SPECS, there was little consensus in the reasons stated as

underlying that decision. The secondary teachers demonstrated a greater consensus in answering this question. Ten secondary teachers [91%] said that SPECS had been adopted in their schools in order to improve curriculum coordination across the district. One secondary teacher [9%] reported that SPECS had been adopted as a means of establishing teacher accountability.

In order to shorten the teacher questionnaire, only Mott administrators were asked to describe the training which teachers had received in the use of Component Three. According to their responses, the elementary school teachers had participated in a two-and-one-half day inservice workshop conducted by SPECS developers. In addition, several problem-solving meetings had been held with district administrators and/or members of the SPECS Development Team. Finally, they reported that several of the elementary teachers had taken a course on PPBS at a nearby university. Mott administrators, however, mentioned no formal training for secondary teachers in the use of Component Three. The only training described for the secondary teachers was a series of small group meetings with administrators from the district.

Of the elementary teachers, two [29%] said that their training in Component Three had been adequate, four [57%] rated their training as inadequate, and one [14%] was unsure. Three of the secondary teachers [27%] considered their training to have been adequate, four [36%] said it had been inadequate, and four [36%] were unsure.

Use of SPECS

Six of the Mott elementary teachers [86%] reported that they had begun their use of SPECS in math, and one teacher (who commented that s/he did not have a math class) reported beginning the use of SPECS in language arts. Addording to their responses, the initial decision to begin using SPECS in math.

had been made by faculty vote.

The use of SPECS Component Three had been extended to other areas on a voluntary basis by six of the elementary teachers [86%]. Of these teachers, four reported using SPECS in social studies, three in physical education, three in reading, two in phonics, and two in science.

When asked whether they were planning to use SPECS in any other classes, four teachers [57%] stated that they were unsure and two [29%] answered that they had no such plans. One teacher [14%] commented that s/he would use SPECS in any other class that s/he taught.

Teachers were asked if they had used any of the documents which were available from the SPECS developers. In addition, they were asked to indicate any major advantages and/or disadvantages which they had found.

Two elementary teachers [29%] reported using the Instructional Program Summary Plan. Both teachers commented that they liked the comprehensive planning necessitated by this document; however, one teacher mentioned that it was difficult to decide in advance how much material students could reasonably be expected to master in a given time span.

Five elementary teachers [71%] reported using the Record of Instructional Program Objectives. Four of those teachers reported that this form had helped them plan more comprehensively and with increased insight. Only one teacher mentioned a disadvantage in the use of this document, commenting that there was too little space for writing.

Four elementary teachers [57%] stated that they had used the Weekly Lesson Plans provided by SPECS. Advantages mentioned were that planning was detailed, that the teacher knew what materials would be needed, and that the plans could be reused in following years. Only one teacher described a disadvantage in that the form required too much detail.

The Record of Student Performance was used by five elementary teachers [71%] and all five mentioned only advantages in using this document. The teachers commented that their records were accurate, efficient, and individualized.

Finally, three teachers [43%] had used the Instructional Program Summary Report. Two teachers commented that the use of this form had provided advantages in giving an overview of the progress made by students in the class. One teacher implied that this information had been helpful in self-evaluation. No disadvantages were mentioned.

Two elementary teachers [29%] reported that they had used no SPECS documents. Both of these teachers reported using their own forms, with one teacher noting that s/he had developed his/her own set of documents modelled after the SPECS materials.

The use of SPECS by the district's junior and senior high school teachers at this time could best be described as developmental. The teachers had been introduced to Component Three materials and methods, but systemmatic involvement and implementation had not yet begun. Four teachers [36%] reported that they had not used SPECS in their classroom instruction. Two other teachers [18%] reported that, although they had developed sets of objectives and incorporated those objectives in instruction, they had not used any of the SPECS documents. The remaining five teachers [45%] described using Component Three in their teaching, four during the 1975-76 school year and one during only the second semester of the year.

The secondary teachers reported implementation in the areas of reading, English, math, social studies, and foreign language. At least one teacher reported planning for SPECS usage in four of the five areas. When asked how these areas had been chosen, five teachers [45%] said the subjects had been

chosen by each individual teacher or by a group of teachers. Two teachers [18%] responded that since they were responsible for teaching only one subject, they had had no choice of subject area for implementation. Three teachers [27%] said the subjects had been chosen by the administration. One teacher [9%] did not respond to this item.

About half of the secondary teachers [54%] had not used any of the documents provided by SPECS developers. Of the remaining five teachers two [18%] had used the Instructional Program Summary Plan, three [27%] had used the Record of Instructional Program Objectives, two [18%] had used the Weekly Lesson Plans, three [27%] had used the Record of Student Performance, and two [18%] had used the Instructional Program Summary Report. Of these respondents, one teacher commented that the Record of Instructional Program Objectives had helped to improve pacing in the presentation of course material; two teachers replied that the Weekly Lesson Plans had helped them to be more organized; and one teacher commented that the use of the Record of Student Performance had provided a clear indication of how well individual students were doing. The only disadvantage mentioned was one teacher's observation that the documents were, in general, time-consuming.

Actual Consequences of SPECS

A frequently voiced concern by teachers was that SPECS may increase the individual teacher workload by increasing the amount of time necessary for instructional preparation. In the 1975 data from Mott elementary teachers, the average reported increase in time spent planning, evaluating and record keeping in one subject was 1.16 hours per week. It was predicted at that time however, that as instructors became increasingly familiar with SPECS materials and methods, and as they began to recycle materials from earlier terms, this

additional time would diminish.

Mott elementary teachers were the only group surveyed which had used SPECS documents for two consecutive years at the time of this study. They were asked to consider only the subject in which they had begun using SPECS and to indicate whether they were currently spending more, less, or the same amount of time outside of the classroom in planning, evaluating and record keeping as they had spent prior to SPECS usage. Five of the seven teachers [71%] said that they currently spent more time than they had before using SPECS; one teacher [14%] indicated that less time was now being spent. Of the teachers who responded that more time was being spent, the average estimated increase in time spent was three hours per week. The teacher who indicated that less time was being spent estimated that s/he spent approximately one hour less per week outside of class. Considering the response same to indicate zero increment, Mott elementary teachers reported an average increase of two hours per week spent outside of the classroom teaching. Because of the small sample size, this figure cannot be judged as a stable estimate of the amount of extra time spent by Mott elementary teachers in general. However, it does tend to negate the oposition that Component Three requires less teacher time during the second year of use.

The secondary teachers reported no increase in time spent outside the classroom in their SPECS courses. Two teachers [18%] answered that more time had been spent outside the classroom; three [27%] answered that the time spent had been the same; two [18%] reported spending less time; and four [36%] said that the question was inapplicable because they had not used Component Three. However, since only three teachers estimated the time change in hours per week, a meaningful average in time increment or decrement could not be computed.

Teachers were asked to specify the single most important benefit which they had experienced in the use of SPECS. The responses of both elementary and secondary teachers are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
The Single Most Important Benefit of SPECS
as Reported by Mott Teachers

BENEFIT	ELEMENTARY TEACHERS	SECONDARY* TEACHERS
Better planning & improved organization	1[14%]	0
Better knowledge of teachers own goals	4[57%]	1[9%]
More individualized instruction	1[14%]	1[9%]
Improved coordination of curriculum	0	3[27%]
Savings in time for preparation	0	2[18%]
Convenience	1[14%]	0
Improved record keeping	0	1[9%]

*Three teachers indicated that the question was inapplicable. Therefore, the percentages in this column do not sum to 100.

The most common benefit reported by elementary teachers was that SPECS helped them to think through their course goals and objectives. When asked to list other major benefits, three elementary teachers [43%] mentioned improved organization, two teachers [29%] reported that recycling materials was profitable, and two teachers [29%] said that they were more aware of their students' levels of achievement.

Three secondary teachers felt that they had benefited most from the im-

proved coordination of curriculum throughout the school district. Only two secondary teachers mentioned benefits which indicated that they felt their own teaching methods had been positively affected by SPECS. Finally, two teachers mentioned that SPECS usage had saved them time in preparation. However, neither of these two teachers indicated using any SPECS documents, and it is not clear which activities they had found to be time saving. No secondary teacher mentioned any other major benefits resultant from SPECS usage.

When asked whether their students had significantly benefited from the use of SPECS, five elementary teachers [71%] answered YES and two [29%] answered NO. Three secondary teachers [27%] responded that their students had significantly benefited, four [36%] responded that their students had not benefited, and four [36%] found the question inapplicable. The teachers in both groups who felt their students had benefited from SPECS agreed that their students had profited from knowing what was expected of them and from knowing how they were progressing relative to those expectations.

Teachers were then asked to indicate the single most important problem which they had experienced in using SPECS. Their responses are given in Table 3 on the following page.

For Mott elementary teachers, the most frequently mentioned problem was getting started in the use of SPECS. Three teachers [43%] reported having had difficulty in understanding Component Three and in learning to use the SPECS documents. Two teachers [29%] responded that their most important problem had been the time demand. When asked to list other problems associated with SPECS, one teacher mentioned needing more instruction in the use of SPECS documents, and another teacher commented that SPECS was time-consuming.

Only four secondary teachers [36%] mentioned any problem experienced from using SPECS with each of these four teachers mentioning a different problem.

Table 3
The Single Most Important Problem in Using SPECS
as Reported by Mott Teachers

PROBLEM	ELEMENTARY TEACHERS	SECONDARY* TEACHERS
Understanding SPECS and the materials	3[43%]	0
Time involved	2[29%]	1[9%]
Problems in writing or wording objectives	1[14%]	1[9%]
Difficulties in organizing materials	0	1[9%]
Lack of agreement among teachers concerning goals	0	1[9%]
Lack of interaction among teachers	1[14%]	0

*Seven teachers [64%] reported no problems using SPECS. Therefore, the percentages in this column do not sum to 100.

No secondary teacher reported experiencing any other major problems. The relative lack of problems for secondary teachers may reflect the ameliorative aspects of a gradual introduction to SPECS or may be a function of their relatively low level of involvement with SPECS.

Possible Consequences of SPECS

Included in the teacher questionnaire was a list of eighteen possible consequences of SPECS. Teachers were asked to indicate whether each of the consequences had been 'certainly true', 'probably true', 'probably not true', or 'certainly not true', based on their own experience. In reporting this data here, the responses 'certainly true' and 'probably true' will be considered to be 'YES' responses, while the 'probably not true' and 'certainly not true' responses will be designated as 'NO' responses. These data are presented

in Table 4.

Section A of Table 4 presents eight possible consequences of SPECS which were judged to be true by at least 75% of all of the teachers who responded to the items. For example, in responding to the statement, "I can better measure and evaluate student learning," seven elementary teachers and seven secondary teachers checked 'certainly true' or 'probably true'. No elementary teachers and one secondary teacher responded 'certainly not true' or 'probably not true'. The percentages given are based on the total number of respondents in each group. Because several persons did not respond to all items, the percentages in columns 1 and 2 do not necessarily summ to 100. The final column presents the total number of both elementary and secondary teachers who responded to each item. The corresponding percentages are based on only those teachers who responded.

The items included in Part A are those with which at least 75% of all respondents agreed. Similarly, Part B includes those statements with which at least 75% of Mott teachers disagreed. Part C presents those statements for which there was little consensus among the respondents.

Interaction of Teachers and Administrators

Five items in the teacher questionnaire were related to teachers' perceptions of the influence which SPECS had on the interaction of teachers and administrators.

Two of the possible consequences listed in the preceding section directly address this question. In responding to the item "Communication between teachers and administrators is improved", four elementary teachers [57%] and seven secondary teachers [64%] agreed. Three elementary teachers [43%] and one secondary teacher [9%] disagreed. Another item, "SPECS causes more tension

Table 4
Mott Teachers' Judgments Concerning
Possible Consequences of SPECS

A. Statements with which at least 75% of all responding teachers agreed.

		ELEMENTARY* TEACHERS #	%	SECONDARY* TEACHERS #	%	TOTAL #	%
I can better measure and evaluate student learning.	YES	7	[100]	7	[64]	14	[93]
	NO	0	[0]	1	[9]	1	[7]
There is more interaction between me and individual students.	YES	6	[86]	5	[45]	11	[79]
	NO	1	[14]	2	[18]	3	[21]
My goals and objectives are better coordinated with those of other teachers.	YES	6	[86]	8	[73]	14	[93]
	NO	0	[0]	1	[9]	1	[7]
SPECS produces more information than is useful to me.	YES	5	[71]	5	[45]	10	[77]
	NO	2	[29]	1	[9]	3	[23]
My planning of an entire course has improved.	YES	7	[100]	8	[73]	15	[94]
	NO	0	[0]	1	[9]	1	[6]
I find that it is easier to report to parents concerning the progress of their child.	YES	7	[100]	5	[45]	12	[86]
	NO	0	[0]	2	[18]	2	[14]
I am better able to choose appropriate course materials	YES	7	[100]	8	[73]	15	[94]
	NO	0	[0]	1	[9]	1	[6]
Communication among teachers is improved	YES	6	[86]	7	[64]	13	[87]
	NO	0	[0]	2	[18]	2	[13]

B. Statements with which at least 75% of all respondents disagreed.

SPECS causes more tension between the teaching staff and the administration	YES	2	[29]	0	[0]	2	[14]
	NO	5	[71]	7	[64]	12	[86]

* Percentages in the first two columns are based on the total number of teachers in the sample. Since some teachers did not respond to all items, do not sum to 100.

** Percentages in the third column are based on the number of teachers responding, to each item in the total number of teachers in the sample.

Table 4
(Continued)

B. (Continued)

		ELEMENTARY TEACHERS #	%	SECONDARY TEACHERS #	%	TOTAL #	%
Overall, SPECS is more of a hindrance than a help in my daily work.	YES	1	[14]	1	[9]	2	[14]
	NO	6	[86]	6	[54]	12	[86]

C. Statements which had less than 75% consensus of all responding teachers.

I spend more time talking to other teachers about instruction.	YES	3	[43]	6	[54]	9	[56]
	NO	4	[57]	3	[27]	7	[44]
My instruction is more individualized.	YES	4	[57]	5	[45]	9	[64]
	NO	3	[43	2	[18]	5	[46]
SPECS requires too much testing.	YES	2	[29]	4	[36]	6	[43]
	NO	5	[71]	3	[27]	8	[57]
There is less room for spontaneity in my daily teaching under SPECS.	YES	4	[57]	2	[18]	6	[46]
	NO	3	[43]	4	[36]	7	[54]
Student achievement is higher in SPECS courses than it used to be.	YES	4	[57]	5	[45]	9	[69]
	NO	3	[43]	1	[9]	4	[31]
Morale of teachers has generally improved as a consequence of the SPECS program.	YES	3	[43]	2	[18]	5	[38]
	NO	4	[57]	4	[36]	8	[62]
SPECS takes too much time.	YES	4	[57]	1	[9]	5	[38]
	NO	3	[43]	5	[45]	8	[62]
Communication between teachers and administrators is improved.	YES	4	[57]	7	[64]	11	[73]
	NO	3	[43]	1	[9]	4	[27]

between the teaching staff and the administration", also addressed the effects of SPECS on communication. Only two elementary teachers [29%] and no secondary teachers agreed with the item, while five elementary teachers [71%] and seven secondary teachers [64%] disagreed.

Teachers were asked how often during the year they had met with administrators concerning SPECS-related issues. Subsequently, they were further asked who had initiated most of those meetings and what major goals had been addressed.

The number of meetings between elementary teachers and administrators reportedly varied between none and almost weekly throughout the year. The secondary teachers reported meeting with administrators between three and eleven times during the year with a modal response of five times.

Most teachers in both groups felt that the majority of meetings between teachers and administrators had been held at the administrators' requests. Four elementary teachers [57%] and eight secondary teachers [73%] indicated that administrators had initiated most meetings; two elementary teachers [29%] and two secondary teachers [18%] said that about the same number had been initiated by teachers as by administrators; no elementary teachers and one secondary teacher [19%] said that most meetings were teacher initiated; and one elementary teacher [14%] did not respond to this question.

In discussing the major goals and purposes of SPECS-related meetings, the elementary and secondary teachers gave very different responses. Elementary teachers described their meetings with administrators as being more affect-oriented. They described the major goals of their meetings as being to keep communication channels open, to clarify the role of SPECS in the school, and to deal with the problems which any individual teacher might be experiencing.

The secondary teachers described meetings which had been highly task-

oriented. They generally reported that they met in small groups with at least one administrator present for the purpose of dealing with issues such as writing objectives, coordinating subject matter across class levels, deciding on textbooks, and otherwise planning for SPECS implementation. The secondary teachers seemed to be satisfied with the way time was spent in these meetings; however, two teachers commented that meetings were valuable only if their planning was actually carried out in the future.

Considering the responses to the five items concerned with teacher-administrator interactions, there was considerable evidence that Mott teachers tended to see SPECS as encouraging constructive interactions. Stated conversely, there was almost no indication that SPECS was perceived by teachers to cause conflict or divisiveness in their interaction with administrative personnel.

Evaluation of SPECS

The teachers were next asked to give an overall judgment of SPECS, of how worthwhile it had been for them. Secondly, they were asked whether or not they would now choose to adopt SPECS. The responses to these questions are given in Table 5. For purposes of comparison, the data on identical items from the 1975 study have also been included.

The first observation that must be made concerning Table 5 is that current elementary teacher judgments tended to be less favorable than in the 1975 data. It is problematic to interpretation of this table that the 1975 data included all elementary teachers who had worked with SPECS, which the 1976 data included responses only from the seven teachers who returned the questionnaire.

Slightly over half [54%] of the secondary teachers indicated that they

Table 5
Mott Teacher's Evaluative Judgments About SPECS

"Considering the benefits and the problems which you've mentioned, could you give an overall judgment of SPECS. In your opinion, has SPECS been worthwhile for you?"

	ELEMENTARY TEACHERS* #	%	SECONDARY TEACHERS* #	%	1975 ELEMENTARY TEACHERS #	%
Yes	3	[43]	3	[27]	14	[88]
No	1	[14]	1	[9]	0	[0]
Unsure	3	[43]	6	[54]	2	[13]

"Knowing what you know now, would you choose to adopt SPECS in your classroom if you were given a choice?"

Certainly adopt SPECS	2	[29]	0	[0]	9	[56]
Probably adopt SPECS	1	[14]	10	[91]	7	[44]
Probably not adopt SPECS	3	[43]	1	[9]	0	[0]
Certainly not adopt SPECS	0	[0]	0	[0]	0	[0]

*All teachers did not respond to the item. Therefore percentages do not sum to 100.

were unsure about how worthwhile SPECS had been for them. However, almost all of the secondary teachers [91%] agreed that they would probably choose to adopt SPECS if they were given a choice. This may indicate that although the secondary teachers were accepting of SPECS, they anticipated benefits which had not yet been fully realized at the time of this study.

Lastly, in the area of the evaluation, teachers were asked to indicate how much various groups had benefited from the use of SPECS in their school district. Associated with each group was a five-point Likert-type scale on which 1 represented the judgment "no benefit at all", 3 represented "a moderate amount of benefit", and 5 represented "very much benefit". The higher the average rating, the more the group was perceived to have benefited from SPECS. Table 6 provides a listing of the seven groups for which this judgment was made, together with the average numerical ratings given by the teachers.

Table 6
Mott Teachers' Judgments Regarding
Who Has Benefited from the Use of SPECS
in the District*

GROUP	ELEMENTARY TEACHERS	SECONDARY** TEACHERS	AVERAGE
Residents and taxpayers of the district	2.4	2.8	2.6
Teachers who use SPECS	3.0	3.5	3.2
Superintendent and other central office administrators	2.6	3.5	2.8
The Board of Education	2.7	3.5	2.9
Students in SPECS classes	3.3	3.7	3.4
Building Administrators	2.9	4.5	3.2
CEPM	3.4	3.5	3.4

* Numerical judgments by elementary and secondary teachers (1 = no benefit, 5= maximum benefit)

** Only five secondary teachers responded to this question.

As shown in Table 6, the overall average ratings of the benefits received by different groups cluster about the midpoint of the scale (i.e., the numerical rating 3). Overall, no group was seen as receiving a markedly low or high amount of benefit from the use of SPECS.

Advice to Other Teachers

The last substantive item on the questionnaire asked the respondent: "Suppose a teacher from another district was considering implementing SPECS, what would be your advice to this teacher?" Responses to this question tended to be encouraging, although several contained a cautionary note. Some representative comments are presented below.

ELEMENTARY TEACHER: "Work with Component Three and understand it before beginning."

ELEMENTARY TEACHER: "This teacher has to be a dedicated teacher who will be willing to put in a little extra time to get his program going."

ELEMENTARY TEACHER: "I would encourage them to use some of SPEC's (sic) ideas but not so much the formats."

SECONDARY TEACHER: "Introduce the program as a pilot in a few areas. Evaluate the program yourself and decide if this is what you want."

SECONDARY TEACHER: "A coordinator must be present with the proper background to institute SPECS. Other teachers from every school must be involved so as to have full cooperation in the district."

SECONDARY TEACHER: "My advice to this teacher would be investigate the program to see it this is what your district needs."

Administrator Perceptions

The questionnaire for administrators was sent to six individuals in the Mott School District including the superintendent, four school principals, and the curriculum director. Three of the six questionnaires were returned. In order to ensure the respondents' anonymity, their positions within the district will not be given here.

Introduction of SPECS

Two Mott administrators reported that their initial impressions of SPECS had been very favorable, while the third reported somewhat unfavorable initial impressions. Characteristics of SPECS which were judged to be initially appealing included the methods of documentation and identifying objectives, and the use of achievement indicators. Also mentioned was the opportunity for coordination of activities throughout the district. One administrator commented that s/he had been attracted by the concepts of accountability and increased community involvement in school affairs.

The administrators were next asked if there had been specific problems in the district prior to SPECS implementation which they had thought SPECS would help to solve. All three answered YES, and all focused on the need to improve curriculum development and coordination in the district. One administrator added that there had been too little communication among school personnel.

The decision to implement SPECS was described by the administrators as a complex process involving several different stages. One administrator stated that this decision had been made primarily by the administrators, with the concurrence of the Board of Education. A second respondent placed the locus of decision-making on a special task force made up of administrators, teachers and union representatives. They agreed, however, that the impetus for investigating

SPECS had originated from within the administration, and that teachers had had minimal, if any, influence in the early exploratory activities. They noted that teachers had been involved later through their participation on the SPECS task force. In addition, they mentioned that the pilot schools had been chosen on the basis of the staff's willingness to participate in the SPECS program. The administrators described individual teacher involvement with SPECS as being voluntary.

When asked about the major problems associated with the implementation of SPECS the following items were mentioned:

(1) The Teacher Union's concern about SPECS being a means of accountability.

(2) Apathy of the staff, in general--due to several programs being undertaken in the past on which there had been no follow-through.

(3) Initial resistance by teachers.

(4) The time-consuming nature of record keeping.

(5) Lack of understanding of SPECS.

(6) Cost.

On the other hand, the administrators mentioned several factors which they believed had helped the implementation to go more smoothly:

(1) The slow pace of implementation.

(2) Excellent indoctrination.

(3) Good intradistrict communication.

(4) Freedom in participation.

(5) The willingness of teachers from the pilot schools to talk to the staff members of other schools.

(6) Administrators and teachers being permitted to visit and learn from other school districts.

It is worthy of note that, in discussing problems associated with implementation, the administrators focused on the need to convince the teaching staff that SPECS would be good for the district and would not create problems for

teachers. This observation reinforces the view that support for SPECS originated primarily from administrators who acted as advocates in encouraging and reassuring teachers.

One factor described as facilitating SPECS implementation was open and extensive communication within the district. The administrators noted that every effort had been made to provide teachers with information about SPECS. At the same time, the administration reportedly remained open to feedback from teachers regarding their opinions and concerns. This emphasis on communication, combined with freedom in participation, had been initiated in order to increase the attractiveness of SPECS for teachers.

Use of SPECS

SPECS is made up of five semi-independent components of which any subset may be operative at a given time in a district. Mott administrators were asked to describe activities within their district related to each of the five components.

Component One, a systems analysis of the school district, had been implemented district wide in Mott. The administrators concurred that a visual display of the districts' programs, functions and activities had been developed as a part of SPECS, and all stated that they has used this visual display in their work. When asked how it had been used, one administrator replied:

> "Our flowcharts have been done in book form in the elementary, junior high, high school and vo-tech centers. These are available to anyone interested in our offerings. They are a great public relations tool for administrators and teachers to show to parents. Also, they are especially useful in explaining the activities of the school to the School Board."

The other two administrators commented that the visual display of programs had aided them in making decisions concerning the expansion and revision of programs. All three administrators stated that they would recommend Component One to an

administrator in another district.

Two administrators indicated that Component Two, program budgeting and cost accounting, had been developed and used in the district. The third agreed, but added that this development was still taking place. All administrators reported using the program budget in their work. The specific uses of the program budget were described in terms of collecting financial data, providing guidelines for spending, and making projections of future costs. All three administrators endorsed Component Two.

Component Three, instructional program planning, evaluation, and communication, includes the instructional planning and evaluation done by teachers. Two Mott administrators indicated that teachers using SPECS had been asked to complete all five Component Three instructional documents which had been designed by the SPECS developers. The third administrator indicated that the teachers with whom s/he worked had been asked to complete all of the documents except the Instructional Program Summary Report .

Two Mott administrators reported that they had regularly reviewed the documents. The purpose of these reviews, which were reported to occur on a monthly or per unit basis, was described by one of the administrators as being to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum. The other administrator commented that his/her major purpose in reviewing teacher documents was to keep informed of students' progress.

When asked if they had kept any of these documents in their possession, two administrators reported that the Instructional Program Summary Plan were accessible to them. One also added that s/he had kept a copy of the teachers' flowcharts. The third administrator indicated that s/he had reviewed all instructional materials, but provided no details regarding the nature and frequency of reviews.

Component Four of SPECS, community based broad goal definition, was described as being in the early stages of development. While the administrators reported that several meetings with community members had taken place, they added that the actual process of goal definition had not yet begun.

Component Five, which assumes completion of Component Four, had not yet been implemented.

Benefits and Problems Resultant from SPECS

The administrators were asked to delineate the benefits and problems experienced by specific groups within the district resultant from SPECS usage. Table 7 summarizes the administrators' responses.

Evaluations of SPECS

When asked to comment on how worthwhile SPECS had been for the district, all three administrators expressed highly favorable responses. Two remarked simply that SPECS had been very worthwhile; the third said that while little benefit had been derived during the first year of implementation, SPECS had been most useful and effective during its second year. All three administrators indicated that, if they had to do it over again, they would favor the adoption of SPECS.

Finally, the administrators were asked about the advice which they would give to an administrator from another district who was considering the implementation of SPECS. All administrators assumed that SPECS would be useful to other district, and gave advice on how to best implement the system. Their suggestions included that implementation proceed slowly and that involvement would be voluntary. Furthermore, it was stated that an administrator should make public information regarding the ways in which SPECS might benefit each group in the

Table 7
Mott Administrators' Perceptions
Concerning Benefits and Problems
for Personnel Involved with SPECS

GROUP	BENEFITS	PROBLEMS
Administrators	An overall picture of the district.	Readjusting own time schedule
	Broader data-base for decisions	Selling SPECS to staff members
	More efficient planning	
	Improved working atmosphere	
Teachers	Easier & more meaningful planning	Too much paperwork
	Accuracy in measuring student performance	Extra demands on time
	More realistic expectations	
	Specific objectives	
Students	Guaranteed instruction	None
	Efficient, consistent curriculum	

district. However, one administrator emphasized the importance of not overloading staff members with initial information. Openness in communication was also encouraged.

II

BETHUNE RIVER SCHOOL DISTRICT

Bethune River School District is located in a midwestern state in the suburbs of a large city. Four thousand students are enrolled in the district, which includes five elementary schools, one middle school, one junior high school, and one senior high school. The district's total professional staff numbers 250 persons.

The teacher questionnaire was distributed by an on-site SPECS Coordinator, to 45 teachers from both elementary and secondary schools who had worked with SPECS. Twenty-seven [60%] of the questionnaires were returned.

In addition, ten administrator questionnaires were distributed, with five [50%] being returned.

A group of teachers and administrators in the district began SPECS planning activities in the spring and summer of 1975, prior to the district's decision to become a field test site in July. This group of teachers and administrators continued their activities throughout the summer, and by fall a set of tentative program objectives for all major curriculum areas had been developed. During the 1975-76 school year, the entire Bethune River teaching staff was informed of their work, and teachers were encouraged to attend planning meetings. The teachers comprising the sample for this study had been active in the district's planning activities during the 1975-76 year; however, seventeen of the 27 respondents [63%] directly stated that they had not actually used SPECS materials in their teaching. Thus, many of the items on the questionnaire could not be addressed by the respondents.

It is important to note that SPECS was introduced in Bethune River in a modified form. Major changes were made in the means of instructional documenta-

tion. In addition, emphasis was placed upon educational theories which, though not incompatible with SPECS, were not an integral part of the SPECS program. The ideas and methodologies which were chosen to augment--and in some instances replace--the SPECS program were primarily taken from Harry S. Broudy's book The Real World of the Public Schools.[3] Briefly speaking, these ideas included recognition of students' individual learning styles and emphasis on establishing objectives and teaching methods within the area of affect and feeling.

Because SPECS was introduced in a modified form, and because so few teachers in this sample reported using SPECS in their classes, much of the information presented here must be considered to be tentative and somewhat suppositional.

Teachers' Perceptions

Teachers' initial reactions to SPECS in Bethune River were more frequently favorable than unfavorable. As shown in Table 8, fifteen teachers [56%] described their first impression of SPECS to have been very favorable or somewhat favorable, while only six teachers [22%] reported feeling very unfavorable or somewhat unfavorable.

Introduction of SPECS

The teachers did not entirely agree about how the decision to implement SPECS in their schools had been made. Fifteen teachers [56%] reported that this decision had been made exclusively by administrators and the Board of Education. Six teachers [22%] indicated that members of the teaching staff and/or members of the community had been involved in the decision. Six teachers [22%] either reported that they were unsure or made no comment.

---

[3]Harry S. Broudy, The Real World of the Public Schools, Harcourt Brace Javonovich, Inc., New York, 1972.

Table 8
Bethune River Teacher's
Initial Reactions to SPECS

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Very unfavorable	4	[15%]
Somewhat Favorable	11	[41%]
Indifferent	5	[19%]
Somewhat Unfavorable	5	[19%]
Very Unfavorable	1	[4%]
No Response	1	[4%]

When asked whether they had personally played any role in the decision to adopt SPECS in their own school, 25 teachers [93%] answered NO, and two [7%] answered YES. Of the two teachers who answered YES, one commented that although s/he had voted on the issue of adoption, the program would have been adopted regardless of the outcome of that vote.

Eight teachers [30%] indicated that they had been given the option of using Component Three in their own classrooms. An illustrative comment was made by one teacher who said, "I may use any SPECS materials as I wish, but I don't have to use any." On the other hand, seventeen teachers [63%] said that they had played no role in the decision concerning whether they would use SPECS in their classrooms. However, fourteen of these seventeen teachers reported that they had never used any Component Three materials. Therefore, a NO answer may have indicated that the respondent believed that the decision had not yet been made. It is interesting to note that, while two teachers from this group commented that they believed that they would have a choice in whether or not to use Component Three, two others said that they had expected Component Three to

be mandatory. Two teachers [7%] did not respond.

Bethune River teachers gave a variety of reasons for which SPECS had been introduced into the district. Thirteen teachers [48%] said that SPECS had been adopted to increase curriculum coordination and to develop programs which would meet the individual needs of students. Five teachers [19%] reported that SPECS had been introduced in order to facilitate program evaluation. Two teachers [7%] stated that SPECS had been adopted in order to satisfy state educational requirements. One teacher [4%] mentioned improved budgeting while another [4%] mentioned planning. Two teachers [7%] commented that SPECS had been introduced because one individual in the district had wanted the program, and four teachers [15%] did not comment.

When teachers were asked how they had felt about the manner in which SPECS had been brought into their schools, thirteen [48%] indicated that they approved of the way in which SPECS had been brought into the district, while nine [33%] stated that they had disapproved. Five [19%] gave no response. The most commonly mentioned issue was the extent to which SPECS activities had been perceived as voluntary. One teacher, who was reportedly favorable, stated, "It (SPECS) was not made compulsory; therefore, those of us who are working with it have a more positive feeling about it." The opposing view was expressed by a disapproving teacher: "It was slammed on us; however, we knew it was optional to attend classes. We all knew we'd have to sooner or later."

Bethune River administrators provided a description of training activities which had been carried out to acquaint teachers with SPECS. These activities consisted of a two-hour orientation session for each building, objective writing sessions which were held over a ten-week period, and two graduate level courses of fourteen sessions each. Because many, if not most, of the activities had been optional for teachers, the extent and thoroughness of SPECS training

probably varied widely among staff members. When asked whether or not they considered their training to have been adequate, eleven teachers [41%] reported that they had received adequate training, six [22%] reported that their training had been inadequate, and ten [37%] were unsure. In evaluating these statements it is important to keep in mind the limited application of SPECS by many of the teachers.

Use of SPECS

As stressed earlier, only a minority of the teachers had used Component Three in their teaching. Seventeen teachers [63%] stated that they had not used Component Three in any of their classes. However, all but one of these teachers commented at some place in the questionnaire that they had been involved in planning and writing objectives for at least one subject area. The remaining teacher may also have participated in similar activities, although such activities were not explicitly mentioned.

Of the ten teachers [37%] who reported using SPECS, four began in the spring of 1975, and six in the fall of 1975. The subject areas were chosen by teachers or groups of teachers and consisted of reading (one teacher), language arts (three teachers), home economics (two teachers), industrial arts (one teacher), and health and physical education (one teacher). One teacher did not indicate the subject area, and another staff member reported using SPECS in an area of special expertise which was not directly instructional. None of these ten teachers reported using SPECS in any additional subject areas; however, three of the ten said that they were planning to do so. Additionally, four of these teachers reported that they were still undecided as to whether they would introduce SPECS into other areas.

Of the seventeen teachers who had not used SPECS, eleven indicated that

they planned to implement Component Three in at least one subject area; two teachers reported that they had no plans for implementing Component Three, one was unsure, and three teachers gave no response.

When asked to list those subjects for which, in their opinion, SPECS was inappropriate, two teachers mentioned math, and one mentioned science. The primary objection to using SPECS in these areas was that it would be difficult to implement activities in the affective domain in these subject areas. This concern, however, would be more applicable to the modified version of SPECS as implemented in Bethune River than to the SPECS program in general.

The use of SPECS instructional documents was not widespread in the district. One teacher reported that s/he had never seen the documents and another reported that s/he had thought that all SPECS-related materials had been developed within the district. However, several teachers reported that they had used the documents.

The Instructional Program Summary Plan had been used by six teachers [22%]. Five teachers commented favorably on this document, pointing out that it had helped them in organization and planning. The only disadvantage, mentioned by one teacher, was that the document would need to be explained before it could be used.

The Record of Instructional Program Objectives had been used by three teachers [11%]. An advantage mentioned by one teacher was conciseness. The disadvantages mentioned were that the document was time-consuming and that it did not include enough activity sections.

The Weekly Lesson Plans had been used by three teachers [11%]. One teacher reportedly liked the document's flexibility, but another teacher indicated that lesson plans required a great deal of work.

Two teachers [7%] reported using the Record of Student Performance. One

said that the document had aided in following the progress of students, but added that it had necessitated too much bookkeeping. The second individual commented only that s/he did not like the document.

No teacher reported using the Instructional Program Summary Plan.

The sparse use of SPECS Component Three materials does not necessarily indicate that they had been unpopular among teachers. The materials may have been relatively unavailable to teachers or may simply not have been promoted by school administrators.

Actual Consequences of SPECS

One item on the questionnaire asked teachers whether their use of SPECS Component Three had effected the amount of time which they had spent on activities outside of the classroom, such as planning, evaluation, and record keeping. The teachers were asked to consider the amount of outside time which they were now spending on the subject in which they were implementing SPECS and to estimate whether this was more, less, or the same as the time they had previously spent on that subject. Of the ten teachers who had used Component Three, three said they now spent more time on outside of class, while six said that the amount of time spent was the same. One gave no response. Considering the response same to indicate zero increment, the nine teachers reported an average of 1.1 hours additional per week spent in outside activities for one course. However, this estimate is only tentative since the sample on which it was based was very small.

Bethune River teachers were asked to describe the most important benefit which they had experienced as a result of the SPECS program. Their responses are presented in Table 9.

When asked to describe any additional benefits, eight teachers [30%]

Table 9
The Single Most Important Benefit of SPECS
as Reported by Bethune River Teachers

BENEFIT	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Improved planning	6	[22]
Instructional objectives more clear	4	[15]
Increased teacher awareness of different learning styles	4	[15]
Improved communication with other grade levels or other schools	3	[11]
Improved organization	2	[7]
Increased individualization in instruction	2	[7]
Better over-all perspective	1	[4]
None	5	[19]

responded. In general, their comments included improved curriculum and better goal-setting methods, but two new items were mentioned. One teacher responded that the staff had become more interested in decision-making relative to curriculum, and one commented that SPECS had aided in planning budget expenses.

Most of the teachers found the question concerning whether their students had significantly benefited from SPECS to be inapplicable to their experience. Of the ten teachers who had used SPECS in their classrooms, three judged that their students had benefited from the use of SPECS, while three said their students had not significantly benefited. Several teachers agreed that it was too early for them to make this judgment.

Teachers' perceptions about the most important problem associated with SPECS usage are given in Table 10. As might be expected, most of the problems

mentioned by teachers involved difficulties in implementing the program. Only six teachers mentioned problems which they had encountered personally: extensive time demands, too much paper work, and the lack of SPECS materials.

Table 10
The Most Important Problem in Using SPECS
as Reported by Bethune River Teachers

PROBLEMS	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Controversy in determining and coordinating objectives	4	[15]
Extensive time demands	3	[11]
Teacher resistance or concern about accountability	3	[11]
Disorganization within the program	3	[11]
Too much paper work	2	[7]
Lack of SPECS materials	1	[4]
No problems	2	[7]
Not applicable or no answer	9	[33]

Possible Consequences of SPECS

Included in the questionnaire was a list of eighteen possible consequences of SPECS. Teachers were asked to indicate whether they had found each of these consequences to be true or not true based upon their own experiences. Five teachers stated that their experiences with SPECS had been too limited to allow them to adequately respond to this section. Twenty-two teachers responded, but seven of these teachers expressed concern that their answers to these questions

might change after SPECS had been fully implemented. Therefore, it must be stressed that many of the judgments in Table 11 are, again, tentative. In this table, the responses 'certainly true' and 'probably true' are coded as YES and the responses 'probably not true' and 'certainly not true' are coded as NO. Furthermore, all percentages are based on the total number of teachers who responded to each item. This number varied between seventeen and twenty-two across items.

Interaction of Teachers and Administrators

Two items described in the preceding subsection were designed to elicit teachers' perceptions regarding the role SPECS had played in influencing interactions between teachers and administrators. One item asked whether or not it was true that SPECS had caused more tension between the teaching staff and the administration. As Table 11 shows, only 20% of the responding teachers considered this consequence to be true in their experience, while 80% considered it to be not true. Similarly, 52% of responding teachers agreed with the statement, "Communication between teachers and administrators is improved," while 48% disagreed.

The inference may be drawn that only a small minority of teachers believed that SPECS had caused increased tension between teachers and administrators, while roughly half of the responding teachers judged that SPECS had improved communication between the two groups.

When asked about the number of meetings which had taken place with administrators on SPECS-related issues, a modal response of twelve to sixteen meetings over the year was given by thirteen teachers [48%]. Four teachers [15%] said they had met with administrators fewer than three times, five [19%] reported between three and six meetings, two [7%] estimated 25 to 30 meetings. One

Table 11
Bethune River Teachers' Judgments Concerning
Possible Consequences of SPECS

Statements with which at least 75% of responding teachers agreed.

	YES # %*	NO # %*
My instruction is more individualized.	17[81]	4[19]
I can better measure and evaluate student learning.	16[76]	5[24]
My goals and objectives are better cordinated with those of other teachers.	17[81]	4[19]
SPECS produces more information than is useful to me.	15[75]	5[25]
My planning of an entire course has improved.	16[76]	5[24]
I am better able to choose appropriate course materials.	15[75]	5[25]

Statements with which at least 75% of responding teachers disagreed.

SPECS requires too much testing.	5[24]	17[76]
There is less room for spontaneity in my daily teaching under SPECS.	4[20]	16[80]
Student achievement is higher in SPECS courses than it used to be.	4[24]	13[76]
SPECS causes more tension between the teaching staff and the administration.	4[20]	16[80]
Overall, SPECS is more of a hindrance than a help in my daily work.	3[15]	17[85]
Morale of teachers has generally improved as a consequence of the SPECS program.	4[21]	15[79]

Other statements.

I spend more time talking to other teachers about instruction.	15[71]	6[29]

*All percentages are based on the number of respondents who answered each item, rather than the total number of respondents in the sample.

Table
(Continued)

Other Statements (continued)

	YES # %	NO # %
There is more interaction between me and individual students.	11[50]	11[50]
I find that it is easier to report to parents concerning the progress of their child.	14[74]	5[26]
Communication among teachers is improved.	13[65]	7[35]
SPECS takes too much time.	9[47]	10[53]
Communication between teachers and administrators is improved.	11[52]	10[48]

teacher [4%] did not respond. The average number of meetings reported was approximately ten.

Fifteen respondents [56%] indicated that most meetings between administrators and teachers had been held at the administrators' requests, eight [30%] said that meetings were initiated equally often by teachers and administrators, and one respondent [4%] said that most meetings were held at the teachers' requests. Three teachers [11%] did not respond.

When asked to comment on the major purpose of these meetings, the most frequent response which was given by fourteen teachers [52%] was that the sessions had been held for the purpose of planning and writing objectives. Four teachers [15%] indicated that the meetings had been held in order to dispense information to teachers. One teacher [4%] stated that the purpose of the meetings had been to make teachers aware of individual differences, and another [4%] said that they had been held to help administrators to understand the underlying concepts of SPECS.

Evaluations of SPECS

Two items on the questionnaire inquired about teachers' general evaluations of SPECS. These items together with the distribution of teacher responses, are given in Table 12.

As Table 12 indicates, SPECS seemed to be reasonably well liked among the teachers. Although only 48% directly stated that SPECS had been worthwhile for them, only 11% stated that SPECS had not been worthwhile. The remainder of the teachers declined to respond, possibly to avoid drawing conclusions so early in their experience with the program.

More conclusively, 77% of the teachers indicated that they would probably or certainly choose to adopt SPECS if they were given a choice. This is a high

Table 12
Bethune River Teachers'
Evaluative Judgments About SPECS

"Considering the benefits and problems which you've mentioned, could you give an overall judgment of SPECS. In your opinion, has SPECS been worthwhile for you?"

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Yes	13	[48]
No	3	[11]
Unsure	8	[30]
No Response	3	[11]

"Knowing what you know now, would you choose to adopt SPECS in your classroom if you were given a choice?"

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Yes, I would certainly adopt SPECS	9	[33]
Yes, I would probably adopt SPECS	12	[44]
No, I would probably not adopt SPECS	5	[19]
No, I would certainly not adopt SPECS	0	[0]
No Response	1	[4]

level of endorsement, particularly if this sample is representative of teachers in the district.

Finally, the teachers were asked to estimate, using a five-point Likert-type scale, how much various groups associated with SPECS had benefited from implementation of the program in Bethune River. On this scale, the numerical value 1 was labeled 'not at all', the value 3 was labeled 'a moderate amount', and the value 5 was labeled 'very much'. The average teacher ratings for seven groups are presented in Table 13.

Table 13
Bethune River Teachers' Judgments
Regarding Who Has Benefited from
the Use of SPECS in the District*

GROUP	AVERAGE
Residents and taxpayers of the district	2.4
Teachers who use SPECS	3.0
The superintendent and other central office administrators	3.6
The Board of Education	3.1
Students in SPECS classes	2.9
Building administrators	2.6
CEPM	3.8

Note: The number of teachers responding to each item varied between 18 and 20.

*Numerical judgments by Bethune River teachers: 1= no benefit, 5= maximum benefit

The average ratings in Table 13 cluster around the midpoint of the scale, the point described as a moderate amount of benefit. It is interesting that the respondents tended to attribute the most benefit to CEPM and central office administrators, while ranking students fifth in the amount of benefit received.

Advice to Other Teachers

When asked to give advice concerning SPECS implementation to a hypothetical teacher in another district, most teachers gave favorable responses.

Among the 23 teachers who responded to this question, a sizeable number, ten teachers, recommended that a teacher learn as much as possible about the

program before deciding whether or not to implement SPECS. The comments of these teachers included:

TEACHER A: "Discuss and observe as many areas and degrees of development as possible. Also get varied opinions within each district."

TEACHER B: "Think twice and investigate thoroughly."

TEACHER C: "Learn as much as you can from people who have already come into contact with the program. Be sure that you understand the overall operation of SPECS."

Three other teachers gave slightly more conservative responses. While not being explicity negative regarding SPECS, these teachers explained that additional time demands should be anticipated. One of these teachers commented:

TEACHER D: "Be sure that individualized instruction is something you strongly believe in. Also, be prepared for a lot of record keeping at first."

Three teachers recommended limited, if any, SPECS involvement:

TEACHER E: "It takes too long to plan. One-and-a-half years and to only have goals and objectives done with no implementation seems foolish and wasteful to me."

On the other hand, six teachers were strongly encouraging in their advice:

TEACHER F: "Do it. The reward of knowing precisely what your students have learned and what you need to teach next is truly great."

TEACHER G: "Use it without hesitation."

Administrators' Perceptions

Of the ten administrators who received the administrators' questionnaire, five [50%] responded. These five respondents included three central office administrators and two building administrators.

Introduction of SPECS

Two of the administrators reported first hearing about SPECS at an administrators' workshop. The other three administrators said that they had first come

in contact with SPECS through discussions with other administrators in the district.

All five respondents described their initial impressions of SPECS as positive. Four administrators categorized their initial impressions of SPECS as somewhat favorable while the fifth reported a very favorable initial impression.

Characteristics of SPECS which were judged appealing by Bethune River administrators included more accurate measurement of student performance, program evaluation, the capacity to logically replan programs, budget management, and procedures to relate curriculum to community goals. More generally, SPECS was reportedly believed to be an organized, yet flexible system.

When asked whether there had been specific problems in the district which they had anticipated that SPECS would help to solve, two respondents answered NO. Two administrators reported that they had believed that SPECS would meet the district's need for program budgeting and one added that s/he had hoped that SPECS would help in improving and evaluating curriculum. The fifth administrator reported that s/he had felt that SPECS would help in coordinating and broadening curriculum goals.

The decision to proceed with SPECS implementation in the district was described as an administrative decision, which had been given the Board of Education's approval. The decision to implement SPECS was reportedly made subsequent to the receipt of a state grant which provided funds to cover implementation expenses.

The administrators reported that the decision of whether or not a particular school would use Component Three of SPECS had been delegated to the staff and administration of each school. One administrator described the process as follows: "A decision was made to work with the middle schools first, the elementary and then high school. Those who were willing to become involved, did

so."

All administrators indicated that teacher involvement in writing objectives, developing materials, and/or using SPECS materials had been on a voluntary basis. Two administrators predicted, however, that participation by all staff members would eventually be mandatory.

The administrators reported that teacher training in SPECS had initially begun with workshops held in each building. During these sessions, SPECS--with some modifications--had been explained to the teachers. Teachers who indicated an interest in participating in the program were later offered two graduate level courses and several additional sessions in writing objectives.

While two administrators reported that they believed teacher training in Component Three had been adequate, two others said that they were unsure. One respondent gave no judgment on this issue. One of these respondents added that teachers had been rewriting Component Three to meet their own needs.

In discussing problems associated with SPECS implementation, two administrators commented that teacher attitudes had been somewhat negative in some instances. In particular, it was perceived that some teachers disliked the idea of accountability, particularly teacher accountability, but also program accountability. A third administrator stated simply that there had been some financial problems. No problems were mentioned by the remaining two respondents.

Use of SPECS

Administrators were asked several questions regarding the nature and extent of the implementation of each of the five SPECS components in Bethune River. While their responses gave some indication of what SPECS activities occurred in the district, they did present a clear picture of the program as it had been introduced in Bethune River. The program, as implemented, included portions of

SPECS as developed at CEPM, modified portions of SPECS, and additional educational theories and methodology. The latter stressed the importance of affective factors in learning and emphasized differences in the learning styles of students. Only the use of SPECS per se can be reported here.

The administrators agreed that a visual display of programs had been created as a part of SPECS Component One activity. Although only one respondent stated that this display had been used in his/her work, all respondents indicated that they would recommend Component One to an administrator in another district.

Component Two of SPECS involves program budgeting and cost accounting. Although it was agreed that a program budgeting system existed in Bethune River, it was not clear whether this system had been developed as a part of SPECS. While one administrator reported that program budgeting had resulted from SPECS, two others reported that it had not. Component Two, however, was unanimously endorsed.

Component Three of SPECS consists of instructional program planning, evaluation and communication. The emphasis in this component rests on the instructional information generated and collected by teachers. Four administrators indicated that they had had no contact with any Component Three activities. The fifth administrator reported that teachers in his/her school had been asked to complete the Instructional Program Summary Plan. This administrator reported reviewing the Plans on a monthly basis.

The purpose of Component Four is a community-based broad goal definition. According to the Bethune River administrators, a set of goals had been developed using the Phi Delta Kappa procedure prior to SPECS implementation.

The administrators reported that Component Five, assessing the achievement of the district's broad goals, had not been implemented.

These responses indicated that SPECS in Bethune River was substantially different from SPECS as created by its developers. As originally conceived, Component Three is a major center of SPECS activities in the classroom, and is therefore, often referred to as "the heart of SPECS." Within this component teachers design their programs, observe and communicate the results of these programs, and replan using the information they have generated. The muted emphasis on Component Three together with the meshing of other educational and psychological theories with SPECS, combine to make the program in Bethune River unique to that district.

Benefits and Problems Resultant from SPECS

The administrators were asked to describe the major benefits of SPECS as experienced by administrators, teachers, and students, One administrator reported that is would be too difficult to assess benefits given the current level of implementation, while a second administrator gave no response. The responses of the remaining three administrators are given in Table 14.

Similarly, a list of the problems which SPECS had caused for administrators, teachers, and students was compiled from the responses of four administrators. These responses are also included in Table 14.

Evaluations of SPECS

The administrators were asked to consider the factors of costs, benefits, and problems and to indicate how worthwhile they believed SPECS to be. Three administrators reported that they considered the program to be highly worthwhile; another judged the program to be helpful, while the fifth was unsure.

Four administrators indicated that they would certainly favor implementing SPECS if they had it to do over again, but the fifth indicated that s/he would

probably not favor implementation.

When asked about the advice which they would give another administrator who was considering the implementation of SPECS, only three substantive replies were given. Excerpts of these three replies are given below:

ADMINISTRATOR A: "I would tell them that they would not notice benefits for a long time. The program is slow in developing and takes total school district support."

ADMINISTRATOR B: "Careful assessment of the staff, its willingness to innovate and its union orientation must be made. A common ground of staff input must be established. The benefits must be 'sold' to the staff and to the administrators."

ADMINISTRATOR C: "I would advise him/her to make sure that s/he understood the program and was totally committed before going ahead. I also would advise this person that the process takes years to achieve on a district-wide basis, and that a person whose sole job is to monitor the program is essential if success is to be attained."

Table 14
Bethune River Administrators' Perceptions
of Benefits and Problems for
Personnel Involved with SPECS

GROUP	BENEFITS	PROBLEMS
Administrators	Better knowledge of curriculum	Skepticism of some teachers
	Better estimates of the costs of programs	Involvement of teachers in more decisions
	Increased teacher involvement in curriculum	Increased paper work
	Increased information for decision-making	
Teachers	Availability of a complete curriculum	Insecurity resulting from fear of accountability
	Better definition of curricular areas	Increased paper work
	Increased information for establishing priorities	
	Feeling of being a part of the system	
Students	Increased individualization in instruction	None
	Better teacher planning	
	Improved curriculum	

III

ANTHONY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Anthony School District is located in a northeastern state. Approximately 4,400 students are enrolled in the district's high school, junior high school, and five elementary schools.

SPECS questionnaires were mailed to the nine teachers and two administrators who had been actively involved with the SPECS program in Anthony. With the exception of one central office administrator, all of the individuals in this sample are employed at the high school. Six teachers [67%] and two administrators [100%] returned their completed questionnaires.

Teachers' Perceptions

Introduction of SPECS

A variety of initial reactions to SPECS were reported by the six teachers in this sample. Two teachers [33%] reported that their initial reaction to SPECS had been very favorable, one teacher [17%] reported having had a somewhat favorable first impression, two teachers [33%] said that they had been indifferent, and one teacher [17%] reported a somewhat unfavorable first impression.

When asked how the decision had been made to implement SPECS in their school, four of the teachers [67%] answered that this decision had been made on the departmental level and had been based on the willingness of teachers in the department to participate. One teacher [17%] described the decision as being made by the administration after consulting with teachers, and one teacher [17%] felt that the decision was primarily made by the administration in conjunction with the department head.

All respondents, however, agreed that they had had a role in the decision

to adopt SPECS in their school in that all teachers in their department had voted on whether or not the department should adopt SPECS. On an individual level, four teachers [67%] indicated that they had decided whether or not they would use Component Three materials in their teaching, and one teacher in this group stated that s/he had felt free to use as many or as few of the Component Three materials as s/he desired. One teacher [17%], who apparently felt bound by the group vote, indicated that s/he had had no individual choice in using Component Three in his/her classes. One teacher [17%] did not respond to this question.

Anthony teachers responded very favorably to the manner of decision making used in their district. All five of the teachers who voiced opinions of this issue approved of the manner in which SPECS had been brought into their school. One teacher did not respond to this question.

The reasons for which SPECS had been adopted centered around the need to improve and coordinate programs in their department. In addition, one teacher felt that SPECS could be useful in justifying the department's budget requests.

SPECS training for teachers, as described by Anthony administrators, consisted solely of a two-day workshop which was presented by a CEPM consultant. Five of the teachers [83%] judged this amount of training to have been adequate for their needs, while one teacher [17%] judged the training to have been inadequate.

Generally, the picture that emerges from these responses is one of high teacher autonomy and influence in determining the fate of SPECS in Anthony. Teachers who had been uninterested in implementing the program remained uninvolved, while teachers who wanted to use SPECS had been active in exploring and acquiring the system for their department.

Use of SPECS

Three Anthony teachers [50%] said that they had begun using SPECS in the spring of 1975, and three [50%] reported that they had first used SPECS during the following fall.

All of the teachers in this sample had used SPECS in an area of special expertise within the vocational education department. No teacher reported having used SPECS in more than one area, although two teachers said that they were planning to expand their use of SPECS to include one additional subject area. Teachers reported that the choice of subject areas for SPECS usage had been made by the teacher or had been determined by the fact that a teacher taught in only one area.

The Anthony teachers were asked to identify which of the SPECS materials they had used and were further asked to identify any major advantages or disadvantages of each document.

The Instructional Program Summary Plan had been used by one teacher [17%]. This individual commented that the document had helped to generate good summary information.

Three teachers [50%] had used the Record of Instructional Program Objectives. The document was reported to provide a clear record of the topics that had been covered in addition to encouraging continuity in planning. One teacher reported the amount of detail required by the document to be a disadvantage.

The Weekly Lesson Plans had been used by five teachers [83%]. Four of these teachers mentioned advantages in using this set of documents which included good design and sufficient room for notes. No disadvantages were mentioned.

The Record of Student Performance had been used by three teachers [50%]. One reportedly liked the layout, while two reported that the records were too detailed.

Only one teacher [17%] had used the Instructional Program Summary Report. This person reported that the document had been very good for program evaluation.

Actual Consequences of SPECS

Anthony teachers were asked to consider the amount of time which they spent on their SPECS subject outside of the classroom. They were then asked to estimate whether this amount of time was more, the same, or less than the amount of time which they had previously spent in outside activities such as planning, evaluation and record keeping. Two teachers [33%] replied that the amount of time spent on outside activities had remained the same. On the other hand, four teachers [67%] replied that they had spent more time on outside activities after beginning the use of SPECS. The average estimate of this increment was 3.75 hours per week. Considering the response same to correspond to zero increment, the average time change for all six teachers was an additional 2.17 hours per week.

In order to determine other actual consequences that derived from SPECS usage, the questionnaire asked teachers to describe any major benefits and problems which they had experienced in using SPECS. Major benefits which were mentioned by at least one teacher included the following:

- Better organization of course material.
- Increased planning.
- Increased knowledge of the program taught.
- Better communication among disciplines.
- Students can see where they are going.
- Increased student motivation.
- More meaningful self-evaluation.

In addition to the above benefits, five teachers [83%] stated that they believed that their students had significantly benefited from their use of SPECS. Only one teacher [17%] said that his/her students had not benefited.

Major problems associated with SPECS usage which were mentioned by four teachers included:

- Increased time demands.
- Increased record keeping.
- Problems in the suitability of forms.
- Most of the additional work could not be done by an aide.

Possible Consequences of SPECS

Included in the teachers' questionnaires was a list of eighteen possible consequences of SPECS. For each possible consequence, the respondent was asked to check one of four responses to indicate whether that consequence had been certainly true, probably true, probably not true, or certainly not true in that teacher's experience. In Table 15, the responses 'certainly true' and 'probably true' are included in a single category designated as YES while the responses 'probably not true' and 'certainly not true' are designated as NO.

As shown in Table 15, the statements with which the teachers tended to agree can be interpreted as expressing positive impressions of SPECS. Disagreement was expressed, however, for both negative and positive possible consequences.

Interaction of Teachers and Administrators

Within the list of possible consequences were two items which addressed the question of SPEC's impact on the interactions between teachers and administrators. Five teachers disagreed and none agreed with the statement, "SPECS causes more tension between the teaching staff and the administration." At the

Table 15
Anthony Teachers' Judgments
On a Series of Possible Consequences

	YES #	YES %*	NO #	NO %*
A. Statements with which at least 75% of responding teachers agreed.				
My instruction is more individualized.	5	83	1	17
I can better measure and evaluate student learning	6	100	0	0
There is more interaction between me and individual students.	5	83	1	17
My planning of an entire course has improved.	5	83	1	17
I find that it is easier to report to parents concerning the progress of their child.	6	100	0	0
I am better able to choose appropriate course materials.	4	80	1	20
B. Statements with which at least 75% of responding teachers disagreed.				
There is less room for spontaneity in my daily teaching under SPECS.	1	20	4	80
SPECS causes more tension between the teaching staff and the administration.	0	0	5	100
Overall, SPECS is more of a hindrance than a help in my daily work.	0	0	5	100
Morale of teachers has generally improved as a consequence of the SPECS program.	1	20	4	80
Communication between teachers and administrators is improved.	0	0	5	100
C. Other Statements.				
I spend more time talking to other teachers about instruction.	3	60	2	40

*Percentages are based on the total number of teachers who responded to an item.

Table 15
(Continued)

C. Other Statements. (continued)

	YES # %*	NO # %*
SPECS requires too much testing.	2[40]	3[60]
SPECS produces more information than is useful to me	3[60]	2[40]
Student achievement is higher in SPECS courses than it used to be.	4[67]	2[33]
Communication among teachers is improved.	2[40]	3[60]
SPECS takes too much time.	2[40]	3[60]

*Percentages are based on the total number of teachers who responded to an item.

same time, five teachers disagreed and none agreed with the item, "Communication between teachers and administrators is improved." Taken together, these sets of responses seem to indicate that Anthony teachers consider SPECS to have had little influence on the quality of their interactions with administrators.

On the whole, Anthony teachers reported relatively infrequent meetings with administrators on SPECS-related issues. Monthly meetings were reported by two teachers [33%], two teachers [33%] estimated four or five meetings over a year, and two teachers [33%] said that they had had no meetings with administrators on SPECS-related issues. Three of the four teachers who reported meeting with administrators judged that most of their meetings had been initiated by the administrators while the fourth judged that most meetings had been initiated by the teacher. Generally, the meetings were characterized as being devoted to problem solving and progress reports.

Evaluations of SPECS

The Anthony teachers responses to two items directed at a general evaluation of SPECS are given in Table 16. The Table shows that Anthony teachers were unanimous in endorsing SPECS as being worthwhile. Furthermore, all of the teachers agreed that they would choose to adopt SPECS if they were making that decision a second time.

In addition to the evaluative statements discussed above, teachers were asked to make a global judgment concerning how much various groups had benefited from the use of SPECS in their school district. For each group, a five point scale was provided which ranged from 1 (no benefit), through 3 (a moderate amount of benefit), to 5 (very much benefit). Between four and six teachers

Table 16
Anthony Teachers' Evaluative
Judgments About SPECS

"Considering the benefits and problems which you've mentioned, could you give an overall judgment of SPECS. In your opinion, has SPECS been worthwhile for you?"

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Yes	6	[100]
No	0	[0]
Unsure	0	[0]
No Response	0	[0]

"Knowing what you know now would you choose to adopt SPECS in your classroom if you were given a choice?"

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Yes, I would certainly adopt SPECS	4	[67]
Yes, I would probably adopt SPECS	2	[33]
No, I would probably not adopt SPECS	0	[0]
No, I would certainly not adopt SPECS	0	[0]
No response	0	[0]

responded to each item and their averaged judgments are given in Table 17.

In Table 17, it may be seen that the two groups which were judged to benefit most from SPECS were teachers and students. Also, the teachers considered CEPM to have benefited rather substantially by the introduction of SPECS into their district.

Advice to Other Teachers

The last substantive item on the questionnaire asked Anthony teachers

Table 17
Anthony Teachers' Judgments
Regarding Who Has Benefited
from the Use of SPECS in the District*

GROUP	AVERAGE
Residents and taxpayers of the district	2.6
Teachers who use SPECS	3.8
The Superintendent and other central office administrators	1.5
The Board of Education	1.5
Students in SPECS classes	3.6
Building Administrators	1.8
CEPM	3.5

*Numerical judgments by Anthony teachers

about the advice they would give to a teacher from another district who was considering implementing SPECS. Of the four teachers who answered this item, two suggested that the most important thing this teacher should do would be to talk to other teachers who had used SPECS. Another respondent said that this teacher should be sure that s/he understood SPECS and knew how it worked. The remaining respondent simply commented, "I would encourage them."

Administrators' Perceptions

Introduction of SPECS

Anthony administrators first became acquainted with SPECS when one of their group attended an administrative workshop in 1974 in which a presentation

about SPECS was made. Subsequently, information about SPECS had been shared with other personnel in the district.

The two administrators who were surveyed characterized their initial feelings about SPECS as having been very favorable. They reported favorable impressions of Component Three, program evaluation, and program budgeting.

When asked if there had been specific problems in Anthony which they thought SPECS would help solve, one administrator stated that s/he had felt that improved organization and accountability of programs had been needed. The other administrator answered no.

Both administrators stressed that the actual decision to implement SPECS had rested with the teachers who had volunteered to work with SPECS in Anthony High School. Apparently, if this group of teachers had not taken the initiative in choosing to implement SPECS, the program would not have been implemented in Anthony.

Training for teachers was described by the administrators as consisting of a two-day workshop which was set up by the teachers and chaired by a CEPM consultant. Both administrators agreed that this training had been adequate.

When asked if there had been major problems specific to the implementation of SPECS in Anthony, only one problem was mentioned. One administrator said that it had been difficult to adapt SPECS materials to the programs taught by those teachers who had worked with SPECS.

Similarly, one facilitating factor in SPECS implementation was mentioned. One administrator felt that allowing teachers make their own decisions had made implementation go more smoothly.

Use of SPECS

SPECS activity in Anthony consisted exclusively of the use of Component

Three by teachers in one department. Neither administrator described activity in any other SPECS components.

Within Component Three, according to one administrator, teachers had been expected to complete the Record of Instructional Program Objectives, the Weekly Lesson Plans, and the Record of Student Performance. Some of the teachers may have chosen to use alternative forms, since all of the teachers did not report using these forms.

The only document which was reportedly reviewed was the Record of Instructional Program Objectives, which was reviewed and typed by one administrator.

Although this level of implementation may seem modest considering the potential complexity of the whole SPECS program, it must be remembered that Component Three, like the rest of the system's Components, can be used separately or together as a complete system. Personnel in Anthony chose to use only Component Three and were apparently satisfied.

Benefits and Problems Resultant from SPECS

The administrators were asked to comment on the benefits and problems associated with SOECT for administrators, teachers, and students. Their responses are presented in Table 18.

As would be expected, the benefits and problems described in Table 18 entirely revolve about the use of Component Three. Because only a small subset of the instructional staff was working with SPECS, there were probably fewer problems and benefits than would result from full implementation.

Evaluations of SPECS

The administrators were asked to comment on how worthwhile SPECS is in light of the costs, benefits, and problems associated with its use. Both

Table 18
Anthony Administrators Perceptions
of Benefits and Problems
for Personnel Involved with SPECS

PERSONNEL	BENEFITS	PROBLEMS
Administrators	Classes are more organized	None
Teachers	Teachers know where they are going	Extra work Increased time demand
Students	Students know what is expected of them Students are guaranteed sequential programming	Students must adjust to a new type of organization

Anthony administrators were highly positive in judging the overall worth of SPECS, and both stated that they would certainly favor adopting SPECS if they had it to do over again.

When asked what advice would be given to another administrator who was considering adopting SPECS, the two administrators an wered as follows:

ADMINISTRATOR A: "Start with Component Three and work outward after the teachers feel comfortable and know where they are going."

ADMINISTRATOR B: "Go ahead."

IV

GILMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

Gilman School District is located on the west coast near a major city. Five thousand students are enrolled in the district's five elementary schools, one junior high school, and one high school.

Questionnaires were provided to five teachers and two administrators who had used SPECS in Gilman. One teacher [20%] and two administrators [100%] returned their completed questionnaires. The low rate of teacher response makes it impossible to follow the format of the earlier sections of this paper. Since only three questionnaires were returned, teacher and administrator responses will be combined in this chapter.

Personnel in Gilman reportedly became aware of SPECS when at least one administrator from the district attended a conference dealing with PPBS in general and SPECS in particular. Information about SPECS was referred to other administrators in the district who had expressed interest, and contact was made with the SPECS staff at CEPM. Two of the respondents from Gilman described their initial feelings about SPECS as being "very favorable" while the third reported a"somewhat favorable" first impression. Both administrators reported that they had found SPECS to be appealing because they favored a systems approach to management and because SPECS appeared to be consistent with procedures and processes which were already being applied in the district. According to one administrator, teachers in the district had already been very involved in establishing measurable objectives and building district curriculum guides. Among other things, they reported viewing SPECS as a tool which would facilitate curriculum management.

The decision to implement SPECS in one school within the district was

reported to be contingent entirely on the desire of one administrator and a group of teachers in one school who would be working with SPECS. All three respondents agreed that individual teacher involvement had been voluntary and that the choice of subject area for Component Three implementation had been made by the five teachers who had agreed to implement SPECS.

An administrator described the training which the staff had received in the use of Component Three as consisting of four formal activities: (1) a workshop held by district personnel who had attended the SPECS conference, (2) a spring workshop with SPECS developers, (3) a fall workshop with a SPECS consultant from a nearby university, and (4) in the following spring, a half-day meeting with SPECS consultants to evaluate their progress and to plan further work.

Two of the respondents described this training as having been adequate in meeting teachers' needs, while the third was reportedly unsure.

No respondent described any major problems specific to the implementation of SPECS in Gilman. One administrator did comment, however, that some teachers may have been disappointed about not being included in the SPECS activities.

On the other hand, several factors reportedly made the implementation of SPECS go smoothly in Gilman. Respondents considered positive factors to have been (1) the high level of teacher involvement in decision-making, (2) the availability of a consultant, (3) the School Board's enthusiasm, (4) the receipt of state funding for the development of measurable objectives, and (5) the opportunity for district representatives to make an on-site visitation to a SPECS district during the SPECS Spring Conference.

The use of SPECS in Gilman was limited to the use of Component Three by a group of five teachers in the area of math. No other SPECS activities activities had been undertaken, but both administrators stated that tasks very

similar to Component Four had been accomplished approximately four years earlier. They also indicated that methods had been developed for assessing the congruence between their objectives and the district's community-based goals (similar to Component Five).

In using Component Three, the teachers had been asked to complete the Record of Instructional Program Objectives and the Record of Student Performance, according to both administrators. The teacher respondent reported using these documents together with the Instructional Program Summary Report. In addition, the teacher stated that a skill continuum which had been developed by the teachers had also been used.

One administrator reported reviewing these documents for the purpose of analyzing the teachers' progress and encouraging their efforts.

Approximately six to nine meetings of teachers and administrators were reportedly held during the year. In addition, one administrator described frequent contacts with a teachers' aide who had helped to coordinate the project and to disseminate information. The meetings were apparently highly task-oriented and involved comparisons of teachers' work, program evaluation, problem evaluation, problem-solving, and planning for future expansion.

In filling out the questionnaires, each respondent discussed benefits and problems which had been experienced with SPECS. These responses are combined in Table 19.

When asked to consider the benefits and problems associated with SPECS and to give a judgment of the overall worth of the program, all three respondents expressed certainty that SPECS had been worthwhile. In addition, all three indicated that they would "certainly favor" the adoption of SPECS if they had the decision to make again.

All of the respondents provided advice to individuals in another district

Table 19
Gilman Respondents' Perceptions of Benefits and Problems to Personnel Associated with SPECS

PERSONNEL	BENEFITS	PROBLEMS
Administrators	Opportunity to deal with specific instructional objectives	Time demands
	Increased teacher competency	
	Program continuity	
Teachers	Assistance with planning and evaluating	Time demands
	Clear, nonredundant, sequential objectives	Record keeping
	Working as part of a professional team	Organization of paper work
Students	A more systematic introduction of skills	None
	Knowledge of what is expected	
	Knowledge of where the class is going	

who hypothetically were considering implementing SPECS. The teacher suggested that another teacher view SPECS on-site, determine goals and purposes for the adoption of a management program and ascertain the acceptance of colleagues and supervisors for such a program. Finally, s/he suggested that the teacher plan to adapt the materials to meet individual, guilding, or district needs. One administrator simply expressed encouragement, while the second administrator advised, "If SPECS is kept flexible, allowing for individual teacher styles concerning how to work with the system, the what and agreement on what falls

into place. Allow for the 'ripple' approach--don't impose SPECS."

V

BEECHER SCHOOL DISTRICT

Beecher School district is located near a major northeastern city. Approximately 3600 students are enrolled in the district's seven elementary schools and one high school.

Four questionnaires, two for teachers and two for administrators were distributed to personnel in Beecher. One teacher questionnaire [50%] and two administrator questionnaires [100%] were completed and returned. As in Section IV, the information from these questionnaires will be combined.

Members of the Beecher administration had been introduced to SPECS through a professor at a nearby university. Two respondents indicated that they had initially reacted "very favorably" toward SPECS while the third individual characterized his/her initial feelings as "indifferent." The two administrators agreed that they had initially liked SPECS because it provided a systems approach to management, program budgeting and program evaluation.

The respondents reported that SPECS had been implemented as a trial program in one department in Beecher High School. Three teachers from this department had voluntarily worked on a summer project in which they had reviewed SPECS materials and met with administrators and SPECS consultants. It was reported that these teachers recommended that SPECS be used in their area in order to provide a model for program evaluation which might later be implemented on a broader basis in the district. The school committee's acceptance of this recommendation insured that Component Three would be implemented by those teachers who favored its use.

Training for teachers in the application of Component Three was described by the administrators as consisting of the summer work project, curriculum and

program evaluation meetings, and regular inservice staff meetings. All three respondents judged this training as having been adequate.

The administrators agreed that there had been no major problems in the implementation of SPECS in Beecher. It was reported that a gradual approach had helped the implementation to go smoothly.

In describing the use of SPECS in Beecher, both administrators indicated that the tasks involved in Components One, Two, and Four had already been accomplished prior to the introduction of SPECS. Work on Component Five had reportedly begun with the establishment of committees which would be responsible for assessing the achievement of the district's community-based goals.

Component Three work had been done only in the physical education department. According to one administrator, teachers in the department had been asked to complete the Instructional Program Summary Plan, the Record of Instructional Program Objectives, and the Instructional Program Summary Report. This administrator stated that s/he had reviewed teacher materials, and that all of these documents had remained in the physical education department which did its own program evaluation.

The benefits and problems that were judged to have resulted from SPECS are given in Table 20.

The three respondents from Beecher were unanimous in expressing satisfaction with their experiences with SPECS. All judged the program to have been worthwhile and all indicated that they would "certainly favor" the implementation of SPECS if they had it to do over again.

The teacher in this sample advised other teachers to consider class size in their decision concerning implementation. S/he also advocated extensive early testing in order that individual student differences might be recognized.

One administrator commented that s/he would advise another administrator

Table 20
Beecher Respondents' Judgments
Concerning Benefits and
Problems to Personnel
Associated with SPECS

PERSONNEL	BENEFITS	PROBLEMS
Administrators	Systems approach	Dealing with questions about teacher evaluation
	Better assessment of programs	Increased paperwork
Teachers	Better understanding of programs	Extra work
	Improved student evaluation	Increased time demands
	Increased student interest and cooperation	Concern about teacher evaluation
		Decrease in time spent with better students
Students	Knowledge of expectations	None
	Increased individualization	

to seek direct contact with individuals who had used the program. The second administrator said that s/he would merely explain that the program had seemed to meet the needs of the Beecher School district.

VI

SUMMARY

This report has provided a description of SPECS activities in five school districts and has presented evaluations of SPECS by teachers and administrators. A total of 53 teachers and 14 administrators comprised the sample on which this report was based.

The reader should bear in mind two caveats when looking at the combined data. First, each of the districts implemented SPECS in its own way. The program was adapted to meet the needs and priorities of the implementing districts, and the system, as implemented, was never different in each district. Therefore, when individuals within a district discussed their perceptions of SPECS, they were reacting to SPECS as they knew it. To combine data across districts necessarily involves the combination of responses to dissimilar innovations, and the results must be viewed with caution. Second, the individuals who responded to the questionnaire may not have been representative of the total population of educators who worked with SPECS. In particular, individuals who liked SPECS may have been more willing to answer the questionnaire than individuals who did not, or vice versa. In light of these cautionary notes, interpretation of the data should remain tentative.

There were six possible consequences of SPECS which were judged to be "certainly true" or "probably true" by at least 75% of all responding teachers. These six consequences of SPECS were:

(1) My instruction is more individualized. (77% agreed, 43 teachers responded)

(2) I can better measure and evaluate student learning. (86% agreed, 43 teachers responded)

(3) My goals and objectives are better coordinated with those of other teachers. (86% agreed, 43 teachers responded)

(4) My planning of an entire course has improved. (82% agreed, 44 teachers responded)

(5) I find that it is easier to report to parents concerning the progress of their child. (83% agreed, 41 teachers responded)

(6) I am better able to choose appropriate course materials. (84% agreed, 43 teachers responded)

Similarly two possible consequences of SPECS were considered to be "certainly not true" or "probably not true" by at least 75% of the responding teachers:

(1) SPECS causes more tension between the teaching staff and the administration. (85% disagreed, 41 teachers responded)

(2) Overall, SPECS is more of a hindrance than a help in my daily work. (88% disagreed, 41 teachers responded)

This pattern of judged consequences suggests that, in general, teachers tended to believe that SPECS resulted in at least some positive outcomes. This favorable view was also supported by the teacher evaluations of SPECS as given in Table 21.

In Table 21 it may be seen that 51% of all teachers agreed that SPECS had been worthwhile while only 9% felt SPECS had not been worthwhile. Also, 79% of the teachers indicated that they would favor SPECS implementation if the choice were being made again, while only 17% indicated that they would not favor implementation.

It may be fairly said that these data suggest a preponderance of favorable opinions concerning SPECS in the teachers who make up this sample. There remains, however, a sizeable minority who are not enthusiastic or are unsure about SPECS.

Finally, teachers were asked how much various groups had benefited from the introduction of SPECS into their school districts. Table 22 presents their

Table 21
Combined Evaluative Judgments
About SPECS for All
Teachers in the Sample

"Considering the benefits and problems which you've mentioned, could you give an overall judgment of SPECS. In your opinion has SPECS been worthwhile for you?"

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Yes	27	[51]
No	5	[9]
Unsure	17	[32]
No Response	4	[8]

"Knowing what you know now, would you choose to adopt SPECS in your classroom if you were given a choice?"

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Yes, I would certainly adopt SPECS	17	[32]
Yes, I would probably adopt SPECS	25	[47]
No, I would probably not adopt SPECS	9	[17]
No, I would certainly not adopt SPECS	0	[0]
No Response	2	[4]

averaged responses on a 5-point scale, where 1 represents no benefit and 5 represents maximum benefit..

While teachers judged CEPM to have benefited most from the use of SPECS in their districts, students and teachers were ranked second and third in the amount of benefits received.

Among the fourteen administrators represented in this study, there was almost total unanimity in endorsing SPECS, with twelve of the administrators

Table 22
Combined Judgments of Teacher Respondents Regarding Who Has Benefited From the Use of SPECS in the District*

GROUP	AVERAGE	NUMBER RESPONDING
CEPM	3.7	30
Students in SPECS classes	3.2	36
Teachers who use SPECS	3.2	38
Superintendent and other central office administrators	3.0	35
Building administrators	2.7	35
The Board of Education	2.7	34
Residents and taxpayers of the district	2.5	39

*1= no benefit, 5= very much benefit

[86%] reporting ig they had the choice to make again, they would "certainly favor" implementation. Only one administrator [7%] indicated that s/he would "probably not favor" implementation, and another indicated that s/he was unsure. The popularity of SPECS among the administrators is not very surprising since members of this group almost always generated exploratory activities based on their enthusiasm for the system. It is reassuring, however, that their generally favorable early impressions were not altered during the course of the implementation and use of SPECS.